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There are two legal issues in the given question.

The first legal issue is whether the Governor of Kuzuland had the power to demolish Chief Ajah’s hotel, Tarzan hotel.

The second legal issue is whether Chief Ajah will succeed in his claim against the Governor of Kuzuland.

Control of land is vested in the state. **Section 1 of the Land Use Act,** herein referred to as the Act, states that land ownership is vested in the Governors of a state. But this power is not absolute. **Section 2 and 3 of the Act** deals with the management and control of land, which is vested in the Governor.

Under revocation of right of occupancy, **section 28 of the Act** gives requirements to be satisfied before a revocation can succeed. There has to be a purpose for the revocation, there should be a valid notice, and compensation. For the purpose of this question, focus will be placed on the requirement of notice. **Section 28(6)** that a notice must state the reason for revocation, and must be personally served on the holder, that is complying to the provisions of **section 44 of the Act,** which has to do with mode of service. This is supported by the case of **Eso Adonye** and **Obasanjo v Minister of FCT.** This was also supported by the case of **Ononjuju v AG of Anambra State.**

To resolve the first legal issue, the Governor of Kuzuland was wrong in the demolition of Chief Ajah’s hotel, especially as no notice was served to Chief Ajah. In **Olateju v Commissioner of Land and House Kwara State,** it was held that the act of the commissioner was wrong because notice was not served personally. And also, an executive order is subject to judicial review and can be dismissed where it is inconsistent with the Constitution, and particularly in this case, the Land Use Act. In this light, the executive order of the Governor of Kuzuland to demolish any public place that continues to run is subject to the provisions of the **Land Use Act** and also the Quarantine Law of Kuzuland.

I will resolve the second legal issue in the positive. Chief Ajah will be able to succeed in his claim against the Governor of Kuzuland by the singular reason that he was not served with notice prior to the Governor’s act of demolition. Although Chief Ajah was wrong in still continuing his business and keeping his hotel running, by virtue of **section 5 of the Quarantine Law** of Kuzuland, it provides for punishment of fines and imprisonment for the default of the order and not demolition as the punishment, especially one without notice. Also, the Constitution provides for right to fair trial.

I will advise Chief Ajah to carry on with his claim against the Governor of Kuzuland, relying on the above given points.